

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

WALTER WILLIAM BLANCK,

Plaintiff,

v.

MILWAUKEE FBI, BUD HALL, GERE MAGNUSON,
ALBERT NESS, STEVEN BISKUPIC,
DANIEL S. CRAFT, CHARLES KOCH,
and DAVID KOCH,

Defendants.¹

ORDER

19-cv-176-jdp

Plaintiff Walter William Blanck is a prisoner at Green Bay Correctional Institution. In April 2019, I dismissed this lawsuit as frivolous; Blanck alleged that he was “chemically opened” by the FBI and subjected to a decades-long conspiracy to harm him orchestrated by members of the federal and state governments and people associated with the Republican Party.

Blanck has responded to that dismissal with two filings that I will consider together as one motion. Dkt. 7 and Dkt. 8. Mostly these documents reiterate the type of conspiracy allegations that this court has repeatedly called frivolous. Blanck does not explicitly ask to reopen this case (19-cv-176-jdp), but even construing his filings as such a motion, I will deny it because nothing in Blanck’s submissions gives me reason to reconsider the dismissal.

¹ Blanck did not caption his submissions that are the subject of this order. He styles them as responses to my order in case No. 19-cv-176-jdp, so I have directed the clerk of court to caption them in the ’176 case. The clerk should docket this order in each of the cases discussed in the order.

Blanck also explicitly states that he wants to reopen a recent civil-rights case that he settled in August 2018 with the help of court-recruited counsel, *see Blanck v. Sumnicht*, No. 13-cv-193-jdp (W.D. Wis.), and reopen his recently dismissed petition for writ of habeas corpus. *Blanck v. Pollard*, No. 19-cv-177-jdp (W.D. Wis.). He doesn't explain why he wants to reopen the habeas case, nor does he address the reason I dismissed that case: he cannot file a second or successive application for habeas relief in the district court unless he first seeks and obtains an order from the appropriate court of appeals authorizing the district court to consider the application. *See* Dkt. 5 in the '177 case, at 2–3. So I will deny his motion to reopen the habeas case.

As for the '193 civil-rights case, Blanck suggests that he was dissatisfied by with the representation he received and would like new counsel, and that he is currently is in danger because prison officials are mistreating his heart condition by failing to provide him with medication and keeping his cell too hot. But Blanck doesn't explain why he thinks that anything his counsel did gives him good cause to reopen a case that has already been settled. And his allegations about current mistreatment do not belong in an already closed lawsuit; they are not reason to reopen the '193 case. So I will deny his motion to reopen his civil-rights case.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that plaintiff Walter William Blanck's motion to reopen case Nos. 13-cv-193-jdp, 19-cv-176-jdp, and 19-cv-177-jdp, Dkt. 7 and Dkt. 8, is DENIED.

Entered January 10, 2020.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

JAMES D. PETERSON
District Judge